UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.            | FILING DATE                        | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. |               |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| 10/596,640 11/15/2006      |                                    | Michel Guillon       | MIG 3050; P50514US                   | 8708          |
| 321<br>SENNIGER PC         | 7590 06/20/201<br><b>DWERS LLP</b> | EXAMINER             |                                      |               |
| 100 NORTH BI<br>17TH FLOOR | ·-                                 | SUGARMAN, SCOTT J    |                                      |               |
| ST LOUIS, MC               | 0 63102                            | ART UNIT             | PAPER NUMBER                         |               |
|                            |                                    |                      | 2873                                 |               |
|                            |                                    |                      |                                      |               |
|                            |                                    |                      | NOTIFICATION DATE                    | DELIVERY MODE |
|                            |                                    |                      | 06/20/2011                           | ELECTRONIC    |

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspatents@senniger.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. |                   | Applicant(s)   |  |
|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|--|
| 10/596,640      |                   | GUILLON ET AL. |  |
|                 | Examiner          | Art Unit       |  |
|                 | Scott J. Sugarman | 2873           |  |

|   | Scott J. Sugarman  | 2873  |   |
|---|--|---|---|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe   | ars on the cover sheet with the o  | correspondence add  | ress                                    |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>02 June 2011</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP   |  | -   |   |
| The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:  | the same day as filing a Notice of a replies: (1) an amendment, affidavited (with appeal fee) in compliance  | Appeal. To avoid abar<br>t, or other evidence, w<br>with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request           |
| a) $\boxtimes$ The period for reply expires $\underline{5}$ months from the mailing date  | of the final rejection.  |   |   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire a Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f  | dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth<br>tter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing<br>b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE  | g date of the final rejection   | n.                                      |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount of the corresponding a | of the fee. The appropria<br>nally set in the final Offic                 | te extension fee<br>e action; or (2) as |
| <ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp<br/>filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter<br/>Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi<br/>AMENDMENTS</li> </ol>  | nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to  | avoid dismissal of the  |   |
| 3. X The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b   | out prior to the date of filing a brief  | will not be entered be  | 221160                                  |
| (a) $\boxtimes$ They raise new issues that would require further cor  |  |   | cause                                   |
| (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below  | ,  | 2 201011/1,   |   |
| (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or   |  | ducing or simplifying th  | ne issues for                           |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c  | corresponding number of finally reje   | ected claims.   |   |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1)  | 16 and 41.33(a)).  |   |   |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12  | 21. See attached Notice of Non-Co  | mpliant Amendment (f  | PTOL-324).                              |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):   |  |   |   |
| <ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all<br/>non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>   | owable if submitted in a separate, t   | timely filed amendmer   | t canceling the                         |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proven the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:   |  | I be entered and an ex  | planation of                            |
| Claim(s) allowed: <u>18-20</u> .<br>Claim(s) objected to:   |  |   |   |
| Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>11-17,21 and 22</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:  |  |   |   |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE   |  |   |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but<br/>because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and<br/>was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>   |  |   |   |
| <ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing<br/>entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of<br/>showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary</li> </ol>   | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea<br>and was not earlier presented. Se   | al and/or appellant fails<br>ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)                        | s to provide a                          |
| 10.   | n of the status of the claims after en   | ntry is below or attache  | ed.                                     |
| <ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but<br/><u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>  | does NOT place the application in  | condition for allowand  | ce because:                             |
| 12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:  | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)   |   |   |
|   | /Scott J Sugarman/<br>Primary Examiner, <b>A</b> rt U  | nit 2873  |   |
|   |  |   |   |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: In claim 11, "...when worn by a wearer of the contact lens..." is a new issue that would require further consideration. Regarding claims 21 and 22, "...eye movement of the wearer..." is different from "...inter-pupillary distance..." in claim 19 and "...distance between right and left contact lenses...: in claim 20, since if the eye movement is the SAME in each eye, the inter-pupillary distance or the distance between the right and left contact lenses would not change. Also, claims 18-20 (allowed) all include a chip, whereas claims 21 and 22 do not .

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In claim 11, "...when worn by a wearer of the contact lens..." is a new issue that would require further consideration. Regarding claims 21 and 22, "...eye movement of the wearer..." is different from "...inter-pupillary distance..." in claim 19 and "...distance between right and left contact lenses...: in claim 20, since if the eye movement is the SAME in each eye, the inter-pupillary distance or the distance between the right and left contact lenses would not change. Also, claims 18-20 (allowed) all include a chip, whereas claims 21 and 22 do not. The phase "...during use..." does not preclude the lens being taken out, heated, changing shape and then being put back in the eye.